

The economic impact of pack donkeys in Makete, Tanzania

by

Niklas Sieber

International Forum for Rural Transport and Development, 150 Southampton Row, London WC1B 5AL, UK

Abstract

This article reviews the economic effects of the introduction of donkeys and compares their cost efficiency with other transport interventions undertaken in the region. The use of donkeys generated larger economic benefits than the construction of a feeder road. Regarding cost efficiency donkeys were comparable with road investments. The donkeys in Makete were only used for production related transport tasks on the farm. The benefits would be higher if the donkeys were also used for domestic transport purposes. Domestic transport is traditionally a female task, but the animals are owned exclusively by men. The study shows that lack of cash is the main constraint to the purchase of donkeys. It is stressed that investment in donkeys may be as equally efficient as investment in roads.

Introduction

This paper is based on a field study to assess the economic effects of the Makete Integrated Rural Transport Project (MIRTP) (Sieber, 1996). The project was conducted by the International Labour Office from 1986 to 1995 in order to improve the transport capacity of rural households. The principal aim was to reduce the transport burden of rural households by improving footpaths, tracks and roads with labour-based technologies, by transport avoiding measures, and by making donkeys available for the local population. Before the project started a survey was undertaken to investigate household wealth, expenditure, transport behaviour, agricultural production and marketing (Barwell and Malmberg 1989).

In 1994 another survey was carried out to identify the socio-economic changes that had taken place. This second survey is reported below. Two hundred and forty-eight households in 8 villages were interviewed: 171 households were a 10% random sample of households in the villages and 77 households were interviewed because they possessed a donkey, bicycle or wheelbarrow. The various databases made it possible to compare the economic effects of different transport interventions. The study concentrated on the Matamba Ward, in the northern part of the Makete District, which is located in southwest Tanzania, 900 km from the capital Dar-es-Salaam. The ward stretches over fertile highland surrounded by mountains, hills, ridges, valleys and a steep escarpment to the lowland. The population density is relatively low (18 people/km²), and growth figures are far below the national average because of strong out-migration. Matamba has a moderate tropical climate which allows the rain-fed cultivation of European crops such as potatoes and wheat, which are traded with the people of the lowlands. Nevertheless, the economy relies on subsistence agriculture. The annual cash income, earned by an average five-person household, from selling agricultural produce amounts to US\$ 120.

The growth of the donkey population

In Makete three donkey centres were set-up to promote the dissemination of donkeys, animals that had not been used in the district before the project started. Even though the animals were promoted all over the district, most were sold in Matamba. This is due to the stronger market orientation of the Matamba farmers compared to the remainder of the district. Before the project started there were three donkeys kept in the surveyed villages of Matamba, by 1994 this number had increased to 56. At first, few animals were bought from the MIRTP donkey centre, later, breeding activity and barter with the lowland population was the main factor of growth. Today, two thirds of the donkeys are female and often used for breeding. The growth rate would have been much higher if the mortality rate of the donkeys had not been so high. The Makete climate could be one of the reasons for this. In Tanzania donkeys are mainly used in hot and dry areas, while the climatic conditions in the mountainous Makete District are wet and cold. The high mortality rates were compensated for by the high levels of reproduction which probably increased the number of donkeys in Matamba more than the importing of animals from outside.

Donkey owning households are better off

The most obvious observation in Matamba is that households with a donkey are much more prosperous than comparable households without a donkey (Fig. 1). The donkeys enable their owners to cultivate bigger plots. On top of this the farmers use more fertiliser because it can be carried to the plots with less effort. Bigger fields and higher inputs enable farmers to double harvests and sales and thus the revenue received from marketing activities. The increased income results in higher spending and a better endowment of the 'donkey households' with kerosene lamps, radios, sewing machines and tin roofs.

High benefits of increased agricultural products

The greatest economic effects can be seen in agricultural production. While 'non-donkey households' market on average only 2.1 tons of agricultural products per year (worth US\$ 120), the 'donkey households' market 5.1 tons (US\$ 240). This increase in production is only possible with the growing use of agricultural inputs. Ninety per cent of the 'donkey-households' use fertiliser, compared to 67% of 'non-donkey households'. The donkeys carry 87% of all the fertiliser purchased by 'donkey households'.

Buying a donkey generates an estimated net benefit by increased marketing between US\$ 40-110/yr/household. It is informative to compare the income changes of households before and after the purchase of a donkey. Although Frieling and Mchoavu (1991) state that the donkey owners were already relatively wealthy when they purchased their animals.

Case study - Donkey owner in Mpangala

A farmer from the village of Mpangala bought a donkey in 1990 from the MIRTTP Donkey Centre. Although it soon died he managed to breed three other donkeys, which he used for transport purposes. They carried 4.2 tons of crops home from the field and another 4 tons to the collection points. The owner did not use the donkeys for transport to the grinding mill or the water point because both were located close to the house. He also used the donkeys to transport produce to the nearby market in Matamba, which he visited weekly. The donkeys transported 18 tonne-kilometres (tkm) annually, and saved about 285 hours of arduous work and drudgery. This enabled the farmer to cultivate more plots that are further away from the homestead and collection points. He doubled his cultivation area and increased his annual income to US\$ 168. His children can now attend secondary school.

Donkeys are mainly used for production related transports

The donkeys in Matamba are used only as pack animals. Each animal makes nearly 100 trips a year and carries a total transport volume of 8 tkm. Even though the donkeys generate an increase in market activity, only 3% of their trips are to markets, while 77% are undertaken to carry crops from the fields and 7% are for carrying grain to the mill (Fig. 2). Thirteen per cent of the trips are transport services for other farmers or members of the family. The main effect of the donkeys seems to be that crops are quickly transported from the fields to the collection points. Not even a single household uses donkeys to collect water or firewood. Firstly, people claim there are no suitable containers to transport water and secondly, firewood is transported in long pieces, which cannot be loaded on a donkey.

Donkeys are used to carry 15% of the household's total transport burden measured in tonne-kilometres. They reduce the amount of work and drudgery, especially for women. These economic benefits can be assessed by estimating the amount of time saved. Assuming that the average load of a donkey is three times that of a human being, a donkey can reduce the annual transport burden by 93 trips which amounts to 133 hours per year. A monetary value of the time savings can be attributed by using the opportunity costs of time, that are represented by the income increase, generated by working the saved time in their fields. The annual monetary benefits for time savings amount to US\$ 10 per household. More time could be saved if donkeys were used for water and firewood collection: but men own the animals, while women have the tasks of carrying most of the domestic transport volume.

Economic benefits from donkeys are comparable to roads

The total annual benefit generated by donkeys ranges between US\$ 55 - 124 per household. This can be compared to a low cost feeder road in Matamba, whose rehabilitation generates annual benefits of only US\$ 17-20 per household (Fig. 3). Absolute benefits only tell half the truth if they are not compared to their costs: the benefit/cost ratio of donkeys and of the feeder road ranges between 5 and 10. Most of the other transport interventions examined in Makete have lower ratios. Only the construction of footpaths

People in Matamba buy donkeys because of the burden they face transporting heavy crops, (especially potatoes) from the fields to the collection points. Donkeys are bought only if their use results in an increase in revenues, which quickly compensate for big investment costs. The purchase of a donkey is rational behaviour only in regions with a strong market orientation such as Matamba.

Another restriction is the low cash income in many parts of the district. At the beginning of the project, the price for the donkeys was subsidised to accelerate their adoption. After the cessation of the subsidies very few donkeys were bought. Without subsidies a donkey costs US\$ 88. In a survey of households half of them said that they could not pay more than US\$ 10, a quarter said they could pay US\$ 20, and less than 10% said they could afford US\$ 40 (Fig. 4). Without access to credit none of the households would be able to buy a donkey at current prices. A credit scheme could increase the number of donkeys sold. If 80% of the price for a donkey was financed by a credit scheme then more than 40% of the said households would be able to purchase an animal.

Conclusions

Donkeys in Matamba are mainly purchased for production-related transport tasks and they considerably reduce the transport burden of rural households. However, donkeys are only bought if they enable farmers to increase revenues, which quickly compensate for the high investment costs. Benefits could be much higher if donkeys were used as well for water and firewood collection. The poverty of the households is the main constraint to purchase and without subsidised credit the demand for donkeys will be zero.

The conventional focus of transport planners on farm-to-market roads overlooks farm transport constraints. This study demonstrates that the use of donkeys on the farm may generate greater economic benefits than the construction of a feeder road. With regard to cost efficiency, donkeys are comparable with road investments. There is no economic reason therefore, why donors and governments should spend large sums for feeder roads and do very little to promote donkeys. The experience of Matamba shows that bottlenecks in production-related transports can be reduced efficiently by the introduction of donkeys as pack animals.

References

- Barwell I and Malmberg C C, 1989. *The transport demand of rural households: findings from a village travel survey*. International Labour Office, Geneva, Switzerland.
- Frieling I and Mchoavu D L, 1991. *The donkey as a pack animal in Makete District*. The Makete Integrated Rural Transport Project (MIRTP) Donkey Programme, 1988-1990. International Labour Office/Makete Integrated Rural Transport Project, Makete, Tanzania.
- Sieber N, 1996. *Rural transport and regional development, the case of Makete District, Tanzania*. Nomos Verlag, Baden-Baden, Germany. ISBN 3-7890-4507-1.